Filed 12/11/01

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED



**COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH DISTRICT**

**DIVISION TWO**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

| | |
|---|---|
| In re CHRISTIAN Q., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law. | |
| RIVERSIDE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES,<br><br>Plaintiff and Respondent,<br><br>v.<br><br>PATRICIA Q.,<br><br>Defendant and Appellant. | E029900<br><br>(Super.Ct.No. J090681)<br><br>O P I N I O N |

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Robert W. Nagby, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.) Affirmed.

Roni Keller, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

Patricia Q. (mother), the mother of Christian Q., who was born in December 2000, appeals from an order terminating her parental rights. The father of the child is not a party to this appeal[1]. Christian was taken into protective custody on December 27, 2000.

Christian has seven older half-siblings, all of whom have been dependents of the court, and all of whom have had permanent plans of either legal guardianship or adoption. Mother had never completed a reunification plan.

On December 29, 2000, the Riverside County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) filed a petition alleging that Christian came within Welfare and Institutions Code section 300[2]. The petition alleged that mother had a chronic and extensive history of abusing controlled substances, and she had an extensive criminal history that included robbery, burglary, battery and assault with a deadly weapon. The petition further alleged that mother had failed to benefit from reunification services offered to her since 1994 resulting in permanent plans of guardianship or adoption for Christian's older siblings. The petition also alleged that the older siblings had been abused or neglected and that there was a substantial risk of similar harm to Christian.

At the jurisdictional/dispositional hearing held on February 26, 2001, mother submitted on the petition. The court sustained the petition and found that Christian fell

---

[1]Initially, based on mother's representations, it was believed that minor's father was Native American. Christian was placed with a Native American family on the Soboba reservation until such time that the tribe determined that father was not a member of the tribe and that Christian did not have Native American heritage. Christian was then placed with a foster family,

[2]All further statutory references are to this code unless otherwise indicated.

within section 300, subdivisions (b), (g) and (j). The court denied reunification services to mother under sections 361.5(b)(10) and (12). Mother was advise of her right to seek writ review of the court's orders and findings. The case was set for a selection and implementation hearing pursuant to section 366.26. Mother wanted Christian to be adopted by a family that she knew through her church.

On May 9, 2001, prior to the .26 hearing, the case was before the court regarding placement. Mother continued to want Christian to be placed with the family that she had selected for adoption. The child had already been placed with a prospective adoptive family 10 days before the mother's nominees had received their foster care license through a private agency. The court declined to order a change of placement, noting that DPSS had waited four months for "something to occur" before placing the child in a prospective adoptive placement.

On June 25, 2001, the selection and implementation hearing was held. Mother again argued unsuccessfully that the minor should be placed with the family that she had selected. Mother submitted on the recommendation that adoption was the most appropriate plan and her rights be terminated without presenting any affirmative evidence.

Mother filed a timely appeal, and at her request we appointed counsel to represent her. Counsel has filed a brief under authority of *In re Sade C*. (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 setting forth a statement of the case, a statement of facts and requesting this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered mother an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but she has not done so.

We have now completed our independent review of the entire record and find no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

McKINSTER
Acting P. J.

We concur:

RICHLI
J.

GAUT
J.